

own domestic energy supplies, in 1977 alone the oil producing countries will take 32 billion dollars out of our economy in exchange for imported oil.

In short, we will be throwing our hands in the air and saying "yes" to a 1,000 percent increase in the annual cost of imported oil over a seven-year period.

Some of our dollars will, of course, come back to us as the oil producing nations purchase food, machinery, technology and other goods and services. These "recycled" petrodollars will help offset some of the economic drain from the energy crisis. But foreign investment—the repatriation of petrodollars—cannot provide us with a permanent solution to the energy problem.

That can only be done by the successful achievement of national energy independence. And until we are self-sufficient, we will remain vulnerable to even higher prices and the threat, if not the actual fact, of another embargo.

The last oil cut-off involved only 14 percent of our national petroleum consumption. Yet it resulted in an estimated loss of 10 to 20 billion dollars in gross national product and threw half-a-million people out of work.

In two years time, we could be 50 percent dependent on overseas sources for oil. If even half of these imports were subject to an embargo, the loss in GNP could exceed 30 billion dollars and the loss of jobs could be in the millions.

Even if conditions in the middle east stabilize overnight, we would still face a situation in which a handful of nations control most of the world's oil reserves. And their control over oil production and pricing means continuing insecurity for the United States if our dependence on these sources remains unchecked.

That is why the Administration is pushing for development of domestic energy resources. And we believe this can best be accomplished by the free market system—a system that historically has been fair, reliable and responsive to dynamic economic situations.

We are convinced that decontrolling domestic oil and gas prices and staying out of other energy development efforts to the maximum possible degree will provide the climate the marketplace needs to respond promptly and effectively to our energy requirements.

This is not to suggest that government does not have a continuing role to play in industry regulation and consumer protection. While overregulation can hinder economic growth and productivity and leave the consumer paying plenty for what amounts to government-sanctioned price fixing in the absence of fair and open competition, the same is also true when the private sector engages in market manipulations. In both cases, the consumer must pay a price set higher than a commodity's true market worth without receiving any additional value for his money.

By removing government price controls on the domestic energy industry, incentives will be provided to encourage the necessary increases in new exploration and production, while for the first time in decades, energy prices will reflect energy's true value to the economy.

At the same time, imposition of a windfall profits tax will provide additional incentives for industry to plow these profits back into new energy development. Both the windfall profits tax and the energy tax rebates will insure that added value is received from higher energy prices in terms of new resource development and spendable income that will be returned to the economy.

For the most part, government's role in the marketplace should be that of a referee or umpire, whose function is to see that the rules are obeyed.

This is precisely the role FEA is playing right now in our investigation of overcharges for crude oil, propane and other petroleum products. Those who would use a national crisis to profit at the public expense through willful and fraudulent price gouging are breaking the rules and undermining the system that has kept our economy free and prospering for almost two hundred years. And I can assure you they will be investigated and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

But while this type of government monitoring is essential to keep the marketplace open, free, and fair, let me emphasize that neither the public nor the government get money's worth from overregulation.

This view has been advanced more and more by people in government, as well as by public spokesmen who are generally viewed as interventionist in their economic outlook—most notably—and perhaps, surprisingly—by Ralph Nader, in some recent comments on the Food and Drug Administration.

In the energy sector, we are trying to strike the regulatory balance necessary to protect the public interest and at the same time, help the operation and growth of a productive economy.

In short, we seek a system that will allow the price of energy to reflect its true value to the economy; that will maintain government's role as an umpire, making sure the rules of free and fair competition are followed and the consumer protected—but that will not intrude government further into the marketplace to usurp competitor's role.

The Administration will continue the effort to establish a free market atmosphere free from capricious or intrusive government decisions that are disruptive to our economic and energy goals and the best interest of the nation. So, let's look at what we are working with.

Our supply of oil and natural gas are finite and they are running out. Higher energy prices provide the necessary profitability to invest in expensive advanced recovery methods for existing oil wells and development of our outer continental shelf and Alaska reserves.

But even with these efforts to increase conventional fuel supplies, we must look to other sources to help fill our energy needs.

The most promising near-term developments in alternate sources are synthetic fuels which can be used to supplement conventional oil and natural gas supplies.

One great advantage of synthetic fuels is their adaptability to our existing energy system with few if any modifications.

Another big factor is that we have immense domestic supplies of the raw materials from which these fuels can be manufactured.

But, the most important factor is that the technology is being rapidly advanced to bring these fuels into prompt and economic commercial use.

Work on oil shale extraction and coal gasification and liquefaction technologies has been going on since World War II in the private sector and in joint efforts by government and industry.

The Energy Research and Development Administration is carrying on these projects through their fossil energy program—a program based on an incentive approach to developing the economically viable technology to convert domestic fossil fuels into the energy forms that will satisfy market demand.

ERDA funds 100 percent of the fossil fuels projects that are in the high risk stages of early development. When projects reach the pilot plant stage, the private sector picks up a third of the investment while government funding totals two-thirds. When the demonstration plant stage is reached, joint government-private funding is equal. The final full scale commercialization is then left totally to private financing.

The President has set a goal of producing 1 million barrels of synthetic fuels daily by 1985. It is a goal I believe we can—and will—reach.

There are more than 125 fossil fuel contracts in existence under the ERDA program. Their total value runs around \$600 million and industry is picking up over 25 percent of the tab.

Much of this work concerns oil shale and efforts to extract the 80 billion barrels of recoverable oil contained in this resource.

At least seven processes for above ground mining and extracting oil from shale have been developed and most are nearing commercial application stages. At least six production projects have already targeted operation dates between 1978 and 1982.

In addition, processes for in-situ oil shale extraction—a cheaper and more advanced technology—are continuing. Numerous methods have been tried, but until recently, few have shown any real promise.

However, recent advances in in-situ production technology indicate the process will be commercially feasible by the early 1980s.

Tar sands—another area of synthetic fuels development from resources within the United States—could yield between 20 and 30 billion barrels of oil. The Athabasca Tar Sands plant in Canada is already producing 52,000 barrels of oil a day at a profit. So commercial development has already been achieved. Here, in the U.S., a number of small private research and development projects are getting underway and the government has agreed to help finance an experimental project with private industry.

Coal conversion technology, most notably in the advancement of coal liquefaction processes to the demonstration state, are also among ERDA's fossil energy projects.

This nation has about 3 trillion tons of coal reserves that constitute about 80-percent of our entire stock of fossil fuel resources. Commercialization of the technologies to produce clean gaseous, liquid and solids fuels from coal, and to improve the direct combustion of coal consistent with environmental standards could supply a major share of U.S. energy demand.

Current Federal budgeting for coal conversion programs totals over \$269 million, with commercial stage development expected by the early 1980s for both liquefaction and gasification technologies.

Beyond the synthetic fossil fuel programs, the government is pushing development of more advanced forms of energy—anticipating both short and long-range applications.

One of the most popular—solar energy technology—is developing along six different avenues. Significant advances in the development of three of these—solar energy for heating and cooling, wind energy conversion, and bioconversion—could have near-term commercial applications if our present rate of advance is continued.

Solar, thermal, photovoltaic, and ocean thermal conversion techniques are in the initial development stage, but have shown exciting promise for providing significant amounts of electric power by the turn of the century.

Geothermal energy development also has the potential to provide a large part of the energy needs in the Western United States and Alaska.

Development of the Geysers, a dry steam geothermal source in Northern California, was accomplished solely by the private sector. The Government hopes that Federal efforts in developing and demonstrating applications utilizing other types of geothermal resources will stimulate additional industry activity so that between 20,000 and 30,000 megawatts of commercial electric and thermal power will be generated from all geothermal sources by 1985.

While this may seem like an overly ambitious goal, accelerated geothermal energy

May 1, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 3593

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman says that this will allow per diem for Members of the other body only while on official business. The last time this matter came before the House, a similar provision apparently provided for Members of the other body to make trips to their home States, even though they were not necessarily on committee business. They could designate their trips as "official business" and receive a per diem allowance, which they cannot do now, and which we in the House cannot do now.

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the chairman on that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, if I may make clear, the Senate situation as it now exists is that Senators on official committee business within their State, within the United States, or elsewhere can draw per diem. They can do that now. This will not change whatever the criteria for their drawing per diem. It will change only one thing and that is they will draw \$35 instead of \$25. House Members presently get \$35.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just observe of course that none of us knew this matter would be called up until 10 or 15 minutes ago. It is very difficult for anyone to form an opinion of its merits, although I certainly rely on the judgments of both of the gentlemen involved. But the amendment does involve section 68B of article 2 of the United States Code. That section provides that regulations governing per diem for the other body will be issued by their Committee on Rules. Without further research the gentleman from Maryland does not know whether this amendment might provide nice cushy trips back home for Senators that we in the House do not have and perhaps should not have. I know the Members of the other body have as many round trips to their homes per year as we have, and that should be sufficient.

I ask the gentleman to withdraw this request until Monday so we can study it over this weekend. Nobody is making trips over the weekend, so we could study it. Otherwise I will be constrained to object.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I will just say this will delay correcting an inequity for all our Government employees who now drive their cars on official Government business and it costs them more money than they can get compensated for.

Mr. BAUMAN. Are they going anywhere between now and Monday?

Mr. BROOKS. It is a very inequitable situation and to delay it further is unnecessary. It is quite clear that the qualifications for entitlement, to per diem will not change as a result of this bill. The rules of the Senate can be changed at any time, as the gentleman and I both know, and so can the rules of the House, but right now the law is that only Senators on official committee trips can take this. It will increase the amount to \$35, just as the gentleman can

draw if he makes a trip that is official business of a House committee.

Mr. HORTON. Perhaps it will help if the chairman would explain exactly what the amendment is.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Texas has explained. I still have reservations and I intend to object unless the gentleman will delay his request. If he wants to pursue it now further I will object now.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from Maryland is making a valid point. I do not know what official business is or how these rules are prescribed. It seems to me a pretty late hour to take up something that is rather important. I support the gentleman from Maryland in simply asking to have some time for us to study this.

Mr. BROOKS. We can work on this forever but I do not know that I can explain this amendment any more clearly or more honestly or more candidly than I have.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will just say to the gentleman from Texas, the issue here is compensation for proper travel by all Members of Congress and employees of the Government. All I want is to assure myself that as one Member, this amendment does authorize proper travel. It may possibly be broader in effect than my interpretation or any interpretation I have heard here in this debate.

I have asked to have until Monday to consider this matter. If the gentleman does not wish to afford me that time by withholding until Monday, I will object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BAUMAN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

(Mr. BOB WILSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOB WILSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LAST OFFICIAL SPEECH OF SECRETARY OF INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON

(Mr. SKUBITZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record the last official speech of Rogers C. B. Morton as Secretary of the Interior. Our former colleague and a good friend is moving on to new and broader horizons as Secretary of Commerce.

This speech summarizes the views and goals of one who champions the cause of national self-reliance and who never doubts our country's ability to solve even its most serious problems. During his tenure as Secretary of the Interior, he faced head-on America's energy shortage and formulated a course of action essential

to our economic well-being and international self-respect.

I commend my colleagues to heed the remarks of Rogers Morton. His sage advice, although not extending beyond the parameters of good commonsense, is inspirational, establishing sound guidelines to extricate us from our current dilemma of energy insufficiency. Rogers C. B. Morton was not only an outstanding Secretary of the Interior, he is a great statesman, who brings to his new position the same insight and perseverance that have already insured his place in the annals of American history.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
ROGERS C. B. MORTON AS CHAIRMAN OF THE
ENERGY RESOURCES COUNCIL BEFORE THE
EIGHTH ANNUAL INVESTORS CONFERENCE,
WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL
29, 1975

Thank you Mr. Kaplan. It is a pleasure for me to be here today.

I bring best wishes from a former colleague of yours and a present colleague of mine, Frank Zarb. He was sorry that unforeseen circumstances prevented his attendance here today.

However, it gives me another opportunity to express myself on a subject which has consumed most of my working hours over the past year. That, of course, is energy—its conservation, its use, and its development.

How we in this nation—in government, in the private sector, and as individuals and consumers—deal with the energy crisis will influence the shape of our economy—and the future of the United States for years to come.

And I believe the President's program for national energy self-sufficiency must be adopted if that future is to be a welcome one.

You in this audience are daily confronted with the overwhelming need for a national energy policy as you work with the capital, the investments and the companies that make up the foundation of our economy and America's position as the leader of the industrialized world.

Our national prominence and the success of our economy have been based on stable supplies of vital commodities available at reasonable and predictable prices.

Now we must grapple with the fact that foreign oil—on which our economy has grown so dependent—can be denied at a moment's notice or priced at still more exorbitant levels.

These dangers were brought home with force to the American people during the 1973-74 oil embargo. The energy crisis—years in the making—was suddenly a daily reality of service station lines and skyrocketing fuel bills.

Today the crisis is less visible, but it is no less formidable—no less dangerous. Last year, the energy crisis meant a shortage of supplies.

This year, it means a continuing and growing drain of American dollars, and with them, American jobs, to pay for imported oil—a drain that is taking an enormous toll on an economy already ravaged by recession.

In 1973, the United States paid 8 billion dollars for foreign oil. Last year that bill jumped to 25 billion dollars. As a direct result, this country ran a balance of trade deficit of 6 billion dollars.

If our oil import bill had stayed the same as in 1973, with all other factors equal, our balance of trade would have shown a surplus of as much as 14 billion dollars.

If the bill had only doubled in 1974, it is virtually certain we could still have had a substantial surplus. But that bill did not go up just 200 percent; it went up even higher to put this nation further into debt.

And if we fail to mount a serious national effort to conserve energy and increase our

May 1, 1975

Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Wirth
Wolff

Wright Yates
Yatron
Young, Tex.

Zablocki
Zeferetti

NAYS—196

Abdnor
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Badillo
Bafalis
Bauman
Beard, Tenn.
Bell
Bennett
Biestler
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Butler
Byron
Carr
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chappell
Chisholm
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conyers
Coughlin
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Davis
Dellums
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
du Pont
Early
Edwards, Ala.
Emery
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Ind.
Fenwick

NOT VOTING—36

Leggett
Mills
Mollohan
Mosher
Murtha
Nix
O'Brien
Peyser
Price
Quillen
Rangel
Rhodes
Rogers

Mitchell, N.Y.
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Calif.
Mottl
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Nichols
Nolan
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Poage
Pressler
Pritchard
Quile
Rallsback
Randall
Regula
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robinson
Roe
Rose
Rousselot
Runnels
Ruppe
Sarasin
Satterfield
Schneebell
Schroeder
Schulze
Sebelius
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Nebr.
Snyder
Spence
Stanton, J. William
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thone
Treen
Vander Jagt
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Whitehurst
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Winn
Wylder
Wylie
Young, Alaska

Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Young of Florida against.
Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Hansen against.
Mr. Fulton for, with Mr. O'Brien against.
Mr. James V. Stanton for, with Mr. Wiggins against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Gonzalez with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Ford of Tennessee.
Mr. Hungate with Mrs. Burke of California.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Murtha.
Mr. Rogers with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Mosher with Mr. Young of Georgia.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

MR. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CONFEREES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1975, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 25

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 25) have until midnight, Friday, May 2, in which to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 5, 1975

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to ask the majority whip about the program for next week.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority whip would yield, I will announce the program.

There is no further legislative business for today.

Upon announcement of the program for next week, I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

The program for the House of Representatives for next week is as follows:

Monday we will have the Consent Calendar and the following suspensions:

H.R. 5405, passengers on cargo vessels; H.R. 5272, Noise Control Act authorization; H.R. 1244, Presidential Protection Assistance Act; H.R. 5153, Bikini Atoll payments; and S. 236, trust territories civil government authorization.

The votes on suspensions will be postponed until the end of consideration of all of the suspensions.

For Tuesday and the balance of the

week, we will have the Private Calendar and as to suspensions, there are no bills on the Suspension Calendar.

We will have H.R. 4510, Foreign Service Buildings Act amendment, open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 5810, Foreign Service Buildings Act amendment, open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 4035, review of decontrol of petroleum prices, open rule, 1 hour of debate;

H.R. 6209, prohibiting variable rate mortgages by Federal savings and loan associations, subject to a rule being granted;

H.R. 4296, agriculture target prices, possible veto override; and S. 1236, Emergency Livestock Credit Act, open rule, 1 hour of debate.

Conference reports, as usual, may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does the gentleman from California have any kind of prediction as to next Friday?

Mr. McFALL. The prediction would be the same as we usually make; that we would hope to finish all the business for the week, and if it is necessary to work on Friday, then we will.

We have a large calendar, but I would think if we would all work hard it possibly would not be necessary to work on Friday.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 5, 1975

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses, and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Rhodes against.
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Price for, with Mr. Quillen against.
Mr. Peyser for, with Mr. Symms against.
Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Talcott against.

S.172

H 3592

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 1, 1975

REPORT ON EVACUATION FROM SOUTH VIETNAM—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94-124)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on International Relations, and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 30, 1975.

The Honorable The SPEAKER,
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On April 4, 1975, I reported that U.S. naval vessels had been ordered to participate in an international humanitarian relief effort to transport refugees and U.S. nationals to safety from Danang and other seaports in South Vietnam. This effort was undertaken in response to urgent appeals from the Government of South Vietnam and in recognition of the large-scale violations by the North Vietnamese of the Agreement Ending the War and Restoring the Peace in Vietnam.

In the days and weeks that followed, the massive North Vietnamese attacks continued. As the forces of the Government of South Vietnam were pushed further back toward Saigon, we began a progressive withdrawal of U.S. citizens and their dependents in South Vietnam, together with foreign nationals whose lives were in jeopardy.

On April 28, the defensive lines to the northwest and south of Saigon were breached. Tan Son Nhut Airfield and Saigon came under increased rocket attack and for the first time received artillery fire. NVA forces were approaching within mortar and anti-aircraft missile range. The situation at Tan Son Nhut Airfield deteriorated to the extent that it became unusable. Crowd control on the airfield was breaking down and the collapse of the Government forces within Saigon appeared imminent. The situation presented a direct and imminent threat to the remaining U.S. citizens and their dependents in and around Saigon.

On the recommendation of the American Ambassador there, I ordered U.S. military forces to proceed by means of rotary wing aircraft with an emergency final evacuation out of consideration for the safety of U.S. citizens.

In accordance with my desire to keep the Congress fully informed on this matter, and taking note of the provision of section 4 of the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148), I wish to report to you that at about 1:00 A.M. EDT, April 29, 1975, U.S. forces entered South Vietnam airspace.

A force of 70 evacuation helicopters and 865 Marines evacuated about 1400 U.S. citizens, together with approximately 5500 third country nationals and South Vietnamese, from landing zones in the vicinity of the U.S. Embassy, Saigon, and the Defense Attache Office at Tan Son Nhut Airfield. The last elements of the ground security force departed Saigon at 7:46 P.M. EDT April 29, 1975. Two crew members of a Navy

search and rescue helicopter are missing at sea. There are no other known U.S. casualties from this operation, although two U.S. Marines on regular duty in the compound of the Defense Attache Office at Tan Son Nhut Airfield had been killed on the afternoon (EDT) of April 28, 1975, by rocket attacks into a refuge-staging area. U.S. fighter aircraft provided protective air cover for this operation, and for the withdrawal by water of a few Americans from Can Tho, and in one instance suppressed North Vietnamese anti-aircraft artillery firing upon evacuation helicopters as they departed. The ground security forces on occasion returned fire during the course of the evacuation operation.

The operation was ordered and conducted pursuant to the President's Constitutional executive power and his authority as Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Armed Forces.

The United States Armed Forces performed a very difficult mission most successfully. Their exemplary courage and discipline are deserving of the nation's highest gratitude.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

REVISING TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PER DIEM AND MILEAGE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 172) to revise certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to per diem and mileage expenses of Government employees, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 7, of the House engrossed amendment, after the matter following line 15, insert:

SEC. 8. The seventh paragraph under the heading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" in the Senate appropriation in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (2 U.S.C. 68b), is amended by striking out "\$25" and "\$40" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$35" and "\$50", respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to express my support for this unanimous-consent request to accept the Senate amendment and pass S. 172, as amended.

As Chairman Brooks has pointed out, the Senate has accepted the House bill in its entirety and has asked that we, as a matter of comity, raise the rate of per diem for Senate employees to the rate applicable to House employees and the rates listed in this bill for executive branch employees. I certainly think it is incumbent upon the House to accept this Senate amendment. I wish to point out that this amendment does not deal

with the provision in the Senate bill which would have modified the authorization for Senate employees to receive per diem. It only changes the rate of per diem for those presently authorized per diem under existing law and Senate rules.

This bill, as amended, has the full support of the administration and Federal employee unions. It will remove inequity which now burdens Federal employees when they travel on Government business and have to subsidize that official business because per diem and travel rates are presently inadequate to cover their expenses.

This bill is urgently needed. I hope the House will accept this agreement with the Senate and approve the Travel Expense Amendments Act, as amended, without further delay.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) whether or not what I have stated with regard to the Senate provisions is accurate.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, that is absolutely accurate. The provision does not include any money for Senate personal employees. It provides only an allowance of \$35 a day per diem for Senate committee employees and Senators traveling on official committee business. This is exactly the same amount that members of House of Representatives committees get. It is quite equitable, and is undoubtedly a fair provision which does not extend the Senate per diem arrangements whatsoever.

Mr. HORTON. I would also like to ask the chairman, in the event that per diem is allowed, that is only on official business; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A lot of the questions that the gentleman raised in his statement covered the questions that I had. I would just like to pin things down in a couple of places.

If I may ask both of the gentlemen, am I correct that this bill does not extend the coverage to anybody who is now not already covered?

Mr. HORTON. That is correct.

Mr. ASPIN. So everybody who gets the \$35 in this bill was getting the \$25 before? Nobody new gets any of the money; is that correct?

Mr. HORTON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. ASPIN. Essentially it covers Senators when they are on official business as House Members when they are on official business, committee members when they are on official business, members of the Senate staff like members of the House staff, but it does not cover personal staff members; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. Only committee staff personnel are involved.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman, and I have no objection.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?